

# SOME REMARKS UPON THE WORKS OF THE EARLY MEDIÆVAL ARCHITECTS, GUNDULPH, FLAMBARD, WILLIAM OF SENS, AND OTHERS.

BY BENJAMIN FERREY, F.S.A., Fellow.

Read at the Ordinary General Meeting of the Royal Institute of British Architects, April 18th, 1864.

THE enquiry I am about to suggest in the few observations I shall address to you, is one I believe that has never formed a field of investigation either with architects or antiquaries, but is a subject which I think may fairly occupy our attention; and in the course of the examination some facts may be elicited tending to show the practice of those who exercised our art during the rise of the Mediæval styles, which reached their culminating point in the sixteenth century.

The many dissertations which have been written upon the origin and progress of the Mediæval styles all dwell upon the successive changes in expression and advancement of mechanical skill in construction, without enquiry into the names of the distinguished men by whose genius Mediæval architecture gradually acquired an excellence equal, if not surpassing that of the great Classic school; whereas the history of classic architecture, on the contrary, supplies not only the several steps by which it obtained excellence, but also the names of the chief architects who became the founders of distinct rules for the use of the orders according to their several modifications upon the antique models. Mediæval architecture is entirely wanting in records of this kind, and has but slender traditional information by which to ascertain the authorship of any one of the four distinct styles which prevailed throughout Europe from the eleventh to the fifteenth century,—not only are the inventors of the styles (if they may be so called) unknown, but the names of the builders of many of our most interesting churches cannot be discovered owing to an entire absence both of historical and traditional information on this head. If we except the founders of some of our cathedrals, whose names are fortunately mentioned, it may be said that the great multitude of our churches are built by men utterly unknown.

Of the exception to this rule I will notice a few examples, where either by incised inscription on stone, or brass, or inserted flint work, mention is made denoting in whose honour the fabric is raised, and couched in some devotional phrases ascribing praise to God. Thus in the case of Valley Crucis Abbey, near Llangollen, across the gable of the west front is inserted this fact:—"Adamus Abbas fecit hoc opus in pace quiescat. Amen." In the tower of the Church of Wanborough, near Swindon, is a brass plate thus inscribed:—"Orate p. Thoma Polton e Editha ux. e ei defunctis. Mag. 20 Philipo Arch. no. Glouceste. Agne et XIII alius eor alius. Dns Everard Vicaria e obs suis pocheais. g. h. Campamile ixerpit Ann° Dom. 1435. Rendered—"Pray for Thomas Polton and Editha, his wife, defunct; for Master Philip Archdeacon of Gloucester, Agnes, and fourteen others his children. For Sir Robert Everard, Vicar, and all his parishioners who this tower commenced, Anno Dom. 1435." Again at Lavenham Church, Suffolk, the founders of a side chapel are thus commemorated:—"Orate pro anima Thomæ Spring et Alicia uxoris ejus qui istam capellam fieri fecerunt A.D. M.OOOCC. vicessimo quinto;" and a few other like inscriptions are met with, some indeed very quaint, and made the vehicle for punning upon the name, as at Christchurch, the Chauntry Chapel of Robert Harys, erected probably in his lifetime: here his name is sculptured upon a shield within one of the quatrefoils of the basement panelling, viz., an initial R. with a hare below it in a cumbent posture, from whose mouth issues a label marked with the letters ys. The same rebus may be traced in other shields, and on a

A A

carved scroll, entwining a gnarled stick or rod in the stringcourse, is the following inscription :—"The Lord King of Bliss, Have mercy on him that let make this, the which was Robert Hary's, M.CCCCC.XXV." At Melford Church, Suffolk, the pious benefactors concerned in the building may be known by the inscription under the battlements and windows, as follows :—"Pray for the soul of Robert Sparrowe and Marion his wife, and for Thomas Cooper and Margaret his wife, and Roger Smith, who with the help of the well disposed men of this town did these six arches rear, Anno Dom. M.CCCCC.XI." Records of this kind are however very rare, and as regards the greater number of our noble Mediæval structures we are left in total ignorance of the persons by whose genius they were erected.

How strikingly does this reticence on the part of the great artists of olden times contrast with the desire for notoriety amongst men of the later ages. How frequently does it happen in examining post-Reformation works that one finds both the heraldic achievements of the founders and the quality of the architect too carefully preserved, while the yet remaining traces of the ancient building, sufficient to attest its superior workmanship, are the only evidences of an earlier building of great beauty, concerning which we literally know nothing. Those architects whose professional duties have called them to the careful examination of ancient work, can bear witness to the intense pleasure they have felt while sketching and studying the ingenious devices by which difficulties have been overcome and beauties produced out of accidental circumstances, evidencing a degree of genius worthy of all praise; how they long to render homage to the honoured name of the author of such constructive skill, and could almost idolize the artist if only known; and yet no clue of any kind has been found by which to ascertain the name, and transmit it for admiration to future generations.

Now I think, although it may be impossible to find out and identify every great ecclesiastical work with some well known Mediæval architect, yet a skilful process of examination may be set on foot through which we may with much probability discover who were the builders of many of our churches, and show by the unerring mark of the artist's own hand how possible it is to detect his work. Once having ascertained the manner and leading principles which guided some of our great ecclesiastical architects, a close comparison of the details of the several buildings in each diocese may result in showing such remarkable similarity as may only be accounted for by assigning the authorship to one man.

Those accustomed to the examination of country churches in the neighbourhood of the great cathedral cities must have been struck with certain resemblances and repetitions of portions taken from the cathedral church, but executed in an inferior manner, showing a want of delicacy both in the mouldings and carvings. There can be little doubt that the art workmen engaged on the cathedral were also employed in building the parochial churches affiliated to the mother church, and naturally copied or took the details of the greater work for their type; this can easily be detected by the want of that life and spirit stamped upon the details of the lesser building, sufficient to show that the performance was not the production of the master mind, but of a subordinate hand. Instances of this sort may be found in some parts of the Church of Wookey, near Wells, and in the tower windows and other portions of the Church of Stoke sub-Hamdon, in the diocese of Bath and Wells. Again, in the diocese of Salisbury the Church of All Cannings shows some remarkable resemblances to parts of the cathedral, and other examples could easily be cited. These inferior imitations may easily be distinguished from the rich and beautiful details of the larger buildings, and it is in these higher class of churches that we may expect to find the indisputable evidence of authorship for which I am contending.

Commencing the enquiry, then, by selecting the accredited works of the following distinguished men, we shall find how completely the theory I have asserted is proved by a comparison of the buildings

they erected in different places. I shall pass over the period anterior to the Norman Conquest, as so much difficulty presents itself in ascertaining with any degree of certainty the actual buildings in England which can be assigned to that date, and notice the works of Gundulph, Bishop of Rochester; Ralph Flambard, Bishop of Durham; Llanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury; William of Sens; Leffrid, Bishop of Chichester; Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester; William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester; and Sir Reginald Bray.

First, as to the buildings erected by Gundulph, Bishop of Rochester, and here on the very threshold of the enquiry we are met by the difficulties which belong to subjects of this kind; for recently, doubts have been raised as to the authenticity of buildings hitherto attributed to Gundulph. Historians and antiquaries have so much adopted the opinions of their predecessors, repeating their statements, without making examinations and investigations for themselves, that the public (led by them) have hitherto implicitly believed Gundulph to be the builder of Rochester Castle, and until lately nobody has ever doubted the fact; but it now appears, after the most careful researches, that Rochester Castle (at least the superstructure) belongs to a period a full half a century later than Gundulph's time. The Rev. Mr. Hartshorne, in a most able paper read before the Archæological Institute, last August, at Rochester, produced documents showing that the Castle was erected by Archbishop William de Corbeul in the years 1128 to 1139,\* but the language of the deed from which this fact is established leaves it doubtful whether the basement of the Castle might not be of earlier date; and a fair comparison of Gundulph's authenticated work at Malling Castle with the fragmentary portions of the early Norman work in Rochester Cathedral and the parts of the basement of the Castle, show such a marked manner in the masonry and jointing so entirely unlike the other Norman portion, that one cannot err in ascribing the work to one and the same hand; in the very mortar there is a peculiarity not met with usually in Norman work. Both at Malling and Rochester the mortar consists of a sort of tuffa, found only in the Cliffs of Dover; this material appears to have been exclusively used in the work by Gundulph. The later construction has no such distinctive quality, and is of the ordinary Norman character.

A difficulty of another kind has been raised, in which it has been gravely questioned whether Gundulph really possessed such skill in architecture as to render it probable that he designed and superintended the works ascribed to him at all; in truth, whether he was more than the presiding Bishop of the Diocese at the time when the Cathedral works were going on, the buildings being erected by some master mason, and carried out by him during the episcopate of Gundulph. Now without attempting here to enter upon a topic which has been so much agitated lately, tending to throw doubt upon the received opinions concerning the founders of some of our great ecclesiastical buildings, it certainly may be safely assumed that Gundulph was distinguished for his skill in building, for Ernulphus, his successor in the See of Rochester, says of him, "*Gundulphus in opere commentarii plurimum sciens et efficax erat*;" expressions which could certainly not be applicable to him merely in his episcopal capacity, but which pointedly refers to his constructive skill; and why should any one be desirous of depriving Gundulph or his ecclesiastical successors of the merit which belongs to them in connection with the great works associated with their names? Education in those early times must have been limited. The laity had too much occupation in feudal contests in the protection of their homes to prosecute the study of art or science, and those tranquil pursuits were necessarily restricted to the

---

\* In the Chronicle of Gervase, the faithful historian of the Cathedral, he states that King Stephen gave and confirmed to the Church of Canterbury and to William the Archbishop the Castle that was in the City of Rochester, where the same Archbishop built an extremely beautiful tower. This valuable passage is conclusive, and removes all doubt of its author from dispute.

cloistered brethren, whose undisturbed lives gave them opportunities for cultivating the sciences, and whose religious zeal, and the desire of increasing the splendour of God's house, naturally led them to the practical exercise of architecture.

Gundulph, originally a monk of the Abbey of Bec, in Normandy, was invited by Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, to England in 1077, and by that prelate's influence raised to the See of Rochester. The incidents in the life of this eminent ecclesiastic have been most graphically described by the Rev. Dr. Hook, the learned Dean of Chichester, in a paper read by him before the Archæological Institute at their last Congress at Rochester. The tastes of the patron and protégé were congenial, and we may easily imagine that the Archbishop saw in Gundulph the capabilities for architecture which might be exercised with advantage in the growing wants of the Anglican church.

Gundulph was born in that part of Normandy called the Vexin. As he died in 1108, being then in his eighty-fifth year, we may fix the date of his birth somewhere in the year 1023. Of his family little is known. Gundulph received his primary education in his native place, and when he had mastered all the learning he could receive at home, he was removed to Rouen. Here his good conduct did not escape the observation of William Archbishop of Rouen. From Rouen he was induced to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, where he encountered many hardships, and on his return was nearly shipwrecked; in gratitude for his preservation he resolved to devote himself to a religious life, and entered the monastery of Bec, in Normandy, where he became a Benedictine monk. Here he formed the friendship of the good and learned Anselm. Gundulph appears to have been of a most sensitive disposition. Dr. Hook observes, when giving many incidents of his life, that there is nothing more remarkable in the history of Gundulph than "his copious weeping;" he seems to have encouraged it as a virtue. In every respect his character as an ecclesiastic contrasts favorably with Flambard. He possessed as many good moral qualities as Flambard was cursed by bad. While Gundulph was sacrist works on a large scale were being carried on at the Monastery of Bec, and this practical man was thus directed to the study of architecture. Had he commenced those studies sooner he would probably have profited by the specimens of Saracenic art which must have met his eye in the East, but we do not trace the influence of his travels in any of the works in which he is said to have been concerned. It was no doubt on the ground of his skill in architecture, that when the Prior of Bec became Abbot of St. Stephen's, in Caen, he sought the assistance of Gundulph. The migration of Gundulph to Caen took place about the year 1066. The works at St. Stephen's were incomplete, therefore he could pursue his architectural studies, and obtain that practical knowledge which he afterwards turned to good account. Gundulph followed the fortunes of Lanfranc, and when Lanfranc was settled at Canterbury he sent for Gundulph, who aided him in his architectural works, and was otherwise employed by him in important negotiations. Meanwhile higher honours were in store for Gundulph. The See of Rochester was vacant. The Archbishop in relation to this small See stood in the position of the king, and through Lanfranc's liberality the bishopric was conferred upon Gundulph. He found the cathedral in such a state of dilapidation, that repairs would be useless. Gundulph offered to procure the funds, not only for rebuilding, but also for increased endowment of the church. In his own person, notwithstanding his engagements as a bishop, an architect and a politician, he exhibited as far as circumstances would permit a model of monastic propriety; he did not permit his monks to eat the bread of idleness, and some of them rendered him assistance in his great architectural works. Gundulph now assumed that character by which he is best known in modern times—the character of an architect. How far his scientific knowledge was employed on those buildings which were erected under his eye at Bec, at Caen, and at Canterbury we are left to conjecture. I am indebted to the Dean of Chichester for these brief notices of Gundulph's career, and to those who take an interest in biography

I heartily recommend the perusal of his learned and amusing paper, which will shortly be published in the transactions of the Archæological Institute. Dartford Church and Darent Church are also said to have been built by Gundulph. The tower of Dartford agrees so closely in character with his other buildings that there can be little doubt it was erected by him, but the Church of Darent does not present the same unmistakeable evidences, and I agree with Mr. Parker that this building is of later date. There is, however, another building, Leeds Church, the masonry of which is so like that of Malling and the tower of Rochester that I think it may be viewed as the work of Gundulph. The White Tower of London, being one of Gundulph's last works, shows much more finish in its details, and is less rude and rough in its construction than the buildings which he erected in Kent, where having to deal with a rough rag stone, the work is less finished.

One of the earliest instances of the manner in which the Norman architects repeated themselves is given in Professor Willis's "Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral." Speaking of Lanfranc, and the buildings which he erected at Canterbury, he says:—"Now Lanfranc, before he was made Archbishop of Canterbury, was the first abbot of the monastery of St. Stephen's, at Caen, the church of which was built under his direction; begun in 1064, and dedicated 1077, after his appointment to Canterbury." The two churches were therefore in building at the same time. The church of Caen, like that of Canterbury, has had its original choir replaced by one in the style of the thirteenth century, probably for a similar reason—enlargement. The portions which it retains are alike in plan and arrangement to the corresponding parts of Canterbury; alike in the number of piers; in having western towers, transepts without aisles, a central tower, eastern chapels to the transepts, and the pillars and vault at the end of each transept; nay, even in dimensions they are, with slight difference, the same. The breadth between the walls of St. Stephen's is 73 feet, which is one foot greater than at Canterbury. The extreme length of the transept is 127 feet; also that of Canterbury is the same. The width of the central alleys was apparently less at Canterbury than at Caen. We cannot now tell whether this singular, and I believe hitherto unnoticed, resemblance between the two churches extended also to the elevations, for no fragment remains at Canterbury from which to judge, except the western tower, which is not the same in decoration; but, as western towers were the last things finished, deviation might have occurred here, although the rest was the same."

The next example which I shall mention where a close resemblance to an architect's other works is to be traced, may be found by comparing the works of Bishop Ralph Flambard, a distinguished architect, contemporaneous with Bishop Lanfranc. Flambard was a native of Bayeux, in Normandy, and his ultimate advancement in England to the princely bishopric of Durham, by the favour of William Rufus, was remarkable. He filled so important a position in his day that a sketch of his character must not be omitted when noting his works, and I will avail myself of the very graphic account of his life as drawn by the Rev. Mackenzie Walcott for introduction here. He says:—"Ralph Flambard, or Passeflabere, was the son of Thurston, a village priest of Bayeux, and his mother was reputed to be a witch, and familiar with demons. The Saxon chronicles say that, as justice of Eyre, he held the gemot, or King's court, throughout England. He was the first author of a work in English law; and, singular to say, Leland mentions that the library of Christchurch (of which he was dean) contained only a single volume of Saxon laws. Henry of Huntingdon and Odericus say that the king called him Flambard (devouring flame) from his insolence. He, however, appears under that name as a land-owner in Doomesday. He lessened the estates of the farmers, and was execrated for his exactions. With his brother Fulcher, the infamous Bishop of Liseux, he distrained the rents and property of English bishops. On the death of his brother Fulcher, he endeavoured to obtain the see of Liseux for his son Thomas. His son Elias succeeded him in his stall at Lincoln, and he had a brother named Geoffrey.

He was vicar of Godalming, chaplain to Bishop Maurice, of London, and the King, Prebendary of Lincoln and St. Pauls, Procurator-General, Chief Justiciary, Lord Treasurer to Henry I., Prime Minister, and a most unprincipled courtier. In 1099, Ralph was consecrated Bishop of Durham, on June 4th, in St. Paul's cathedral, having previously been compelled to give £1000 to the king for his promotion. In 1088, the king gave him the chaplaincy to the abbey of Winchester; in 1089, the archbishopric of Canterbury, when, to secure his promotion, he gave the king all he could; in 1092, the bishopric of Lincoln and abbey of Chertsey. He was the most subtle of men in evil; he robbed every church under his charge, and reduced rich and poor to such indigence that they preferred death to life under him. In 1095, the kingdom was entrusted to him, while he held sixteen churches, cathedrals, and abbeys, without bishop or abbot, which he reduced to the depths of poverty. He invented new offences in order to create fines; introduced money compensations for crimes; and, like a true Erastian, recommended that temporalities during the vacancy of a see should devolve on the crown, while he made simoniacal contracts with aspirants to the mitre before he would recommend them to the king. One archbishopric, four sees, and eleven abbeys were in consequence kept in the king's hands for years, and remained unfilled. He was committed to the Tower, where he was allowed two shillings a day (equal to thirty shillings sterling), on a charge of malversation, August, 1100; but he contrived to intoxicate his keepers, and escape by means of a rope, which had been concealed in a pitcher of wine, on February 4th, 1101, cutting his ungloved hands to the bone in the act. He fled to Normandy, where he endeavoured to incite Duke Robert into rebellion, and accompanied him in his invasion: he was restored to his see in 1107, after the retirement of that prince. Finding that his death was approaching, he caused himself to be carried into the minster, and, by offering of a ring before the high altar, made restitution to the prior of several possessions and privileges which he had detained by violence. He died September 5th, 1128, and was buried at Durham cathedral, the nave of which he built. He was a great architect, and besides the nave of Christchurch and Durham, he erected Norham Castle, Mottesford Priory, county of Lincoln, and Kepyer Hospital, Durham.

I could not resist giving you this biographical sketch of one of our greatest ecclesiastical architects of the twelfth century. With his moral character, however, we have nothing to do, and though we may execrate his vices, we are not at liberty to repudiate his surpassing skill in science and art, on which I now proceed to speak. Of his castellated buildings there is not much to say; time and its attendant vicissitudes have robbed the building of all its prominent architectural features, and little can be discerned to identify the castle with its first builder. Successive Bishops of Durham from time to time strengthened this border fortress, and increased its fortifications. Shattered and dismantled it now stands—a majestic ruin—distinguished by its grand position in the far-famed charm of Scotland's poet:—

“Day set on Norham's castled steep;  
On Tweed's fair river, broad and deep—  
And Cheviot's mountains lone.  
The battled towers, the donjon keep,  
The loop-hole grates where captives weep,  
The flanking walls that round it sweep,  
In yellow lustre shone.”

We have it upon undoubted historical evidence that Hugh Pudsey, Bishop of Durham, received orders from King Stephen to build a castle upon the Tweed at Norham, which had formerly been erected by Bishop Flambard, and destroyed by the Scots; the remains, therefore, we now see, and which evoked the spirited lines above quoted, are probably only the ruins of the later castle erected by Hugh Pudsey, who, indeed, was little inferior as an architect to his notorious predecessor Flambard.

It appears that Flambard was elected Dean of the Priory Church of Christchurch, Twynham, at the latter end of the eleventh century, and contemplated the entire rebuilding of that church upon an enlarged scale, but his rapid promotion prevented the fulfilment of his intention; he, however, built the fine Norman nave and transept, and had commenced other works there, which were suspended on his removal, and subsequently completed in the early English style which so soon followed.

A description of the noble nave of Christchurch is here desirable, in order to show the distinctive character of Flambard's architecture and the dissimilarity of his style from other great Norman works then constructing in England, and also to identify his detailed manner both at Christchurch and Durham. The nave of Christchurch consists of seven bays; every bay is divided by a clustered group of semicircular shafts, separated by square piers, each shaft having a capital ornamented with the peculiar foliage resembling the Grecian honey-suckle, these again carrying semi-circular arches slightly, stilted with square and semi-round members corresponding to the shafts below. Two of the shafts facing the nave and dividing the bays, rise through the triforium and terminate a little short of the clerestory, where some transitional corbels of peculiar form, grafted upon the Norman shafts, form the springers of early English vaulting. The spandril walls of the lower arcade are ornamented with hatch-work and fish scales; a stringcourse of chevron-ornament crowns the arcade, whence springs the triforium, each bay containing double engaged circular columns, carrying a bold semi-circular arch, enclosing coupled arches in a second order resting on a central column and corresponding engaged shafts.

The peculiar feature of this design consists in the point at which the groining springs, being some feet below the path of the clerestory or upper wall passage. As a general rule the groining springs on a level with the clerestory, whereas both here and at Durham the vaulting starts from an unusually low position. It is somewhat remarkable that neither at Christchurch nor Durham did Flambard complete the clerestory or groining. The manner of Flambard is at once original and marked, both at Christchurch and Durham he adopts the same peculiarity.

Again, in comparing the aisles of the two churches it will be seen that the wall spaces under the windows are ornamented by bold arcades, both within and without. At Christchurch the inner arcading consists of semi-circular arches on detached round shafts, and externally are discoverable (though covered by later work) the traces of bold intersecting arches and columns, such as may be found all round the north transept. At Durham, by way of difference, the reverse arrangement occurs; internally we have the intersecting arches, and outside the range of semi-circular arches on single shafts. Nor do general resemblances end here; in the mode of lighting the triforium we perceive the identical disposition of single light windows, and attached to the rear of the great piers are well defined flat projections, with corresponding projections against the outer walls, evidently built to receive semi-circular arches, which by their bulk should act as counterforts to groining. At Christchurch the piers only are executed, but they are finished with a well moulded abacus; at Durham, where the arches are completed, this feature is wanting, but I think these preparations may be taken as conclusive evidence that Flambard intended each building to be groined, though this particular work was not carried into effect in his day, but somewhat later. So far, in many respects, the works of this great architect carry the impress of his manner, and in noticing the points of departure we observe that they are such as would follow in consequence of the increased scale of the cathedral over the conventual church.

The nave of Durham is one of the most grand and imposing interiors in this country. The introduction of the massive cylindrical column alternately with the clustered piers is most happy in effect. Flambard did not live to carry out his full intention at Durham, either by stone groining or

flat ceiling, as at Peterborough, yet the preparations above alluded to show what he would have done; and we cannot but commend the good taste of his successor, Prior Melsonby, who notwithstanding the change of style which had taken place, and the prevalence of the pointed arch in his day, yet still availed himself of the semi-circular instead of pointed vaulting, and thus completed the work of Flambard in one homogenous style.

By the way, I may mention another instance of this deference to the intention of a previous architect, though of much later date; it occurs in the cloisters of Norwich Cathedral. These cloisters were commenced by Bishop Walpole in 1297, but his death took place before he had proceeded far with his work. Richard Uppingham, who succeeded him, built three compartments more; he was followed by Bishop Salmon, who erected five compartments, with the whole of the south wall. The north wall, forming the completion of this famous cloister, was effected in the time of Walter Worsted, Prior of the Church, in 1430. Yet though this cloister was built at different times and by different persons, we find a general uniformity of style prevail in the details of the columns, capitals and groining, and even to many of the mouldings of the four sides. This was certainly not the usual practice of those times; each man generally built his portion in the advancing style of his day, without regard to congruity with the work of his predecessor, and so marked a departure is deserving of special notice. But to return to Flambard. There is another kind of external decoration, both at Christchurch and Durham, in the bold lattice or reticulated work, which is evidently peculiar to him. In the round turret of the north-east angle of the north transept of Christchurch this lattice work ornamentation is most striking and effective; it is really like a net formed by large ropes girding the masonry and holding it together. Its application to a round structure on such a scale is perfectly unique, and it is difficult to resist the supposition that some kind of symbolism was intended by the composition: the spandrils of the intersecting wall arcade are wrought with the fish-scale and herring-bone channelling, while the twisted columns by their varied convolutions seem borrowed from the shells abounding on the shores of the sea close by. The gable of the south transept of Durham Cathedral is filled with this net-work device, and also the lower stage of the west end of the Galillea Chapel. I am not aware that any other Norman building possesses this ornamentation upon so large a scale; there is a little of the kind in the south front of Rochester Cathedral, but so diminutive in its proportions that it merits little notice. In the drawings of the compartments of the naves of Christchurch and Durham will be observed the close resemblance which exists between them, and by contrasting them with those of Romsey Abbey (not far from Christchurch) and the Cathedral at Oxford, it will be apparent how totally unlike they are to each other in all respects, and how completely the former work is the production of a different mind.

The next remarkable example of close resemblance between the works of the same architect belongs to the period of the thirteenth century, when the first pointed style had become generally developed in England and France. Here again I shall refer to our greatest authority in the discrimination of works belonging to different periods. Professor Willis having unravelled some of the most difficult problems which before his time had puzzled antiquaries, who for the want of scientific knowledge so largely possessed by Willis, could only hazard conjecture upon the ages of ancient workmanship. The Professor, bringing to bear upon these subjects a great amount of practical knowledge, has placed beyond the possibility of doubt the correct lines of demarcation between masses of masonry welded together at different periods, and presenting to the less informed archæologist matters of doubtful date.

In reference, then, to the portions of Canterbury Cathedral built by William of Sens (not William the Englishman), for two architects named William were employed in succession upon the Metropolitan



Church; Professor Willis remarks: "It is certain that the pillars to the choir, with the pier arches and the clerestory walls above, are wholly the work of William of Sens." This result the Professor arrives at from the internal evidence which the building affords, and by the aid of the historical account of the rebuilding furnished by Gervase the Monk, of Canterbury. Let us now see how far this assumed work at Canterbury harmonizes or corresponds in character with other buildings designed by William of Sens elsewhere. Referring, then, to the Cathedral at Sens, a considerable part of which was designed by him, we are struck at once with the close resemblance between the choirs of Sens and Canterbury both in plan and elevation; each terminate in an apse of seven sides, the compartments are separated by single round pillars, having bold capitals with square abaci carrying simple but effective moulded arches: above are the openings of the triforium, each bay comprises two arches and pillars in a secondary order; above is a lofty coupled clerestory window, filling up the bay of vaulting. Single vaulting shafts spring from the capitals of the lower arcade and rise to the top of the triforium where the stone vaulting commences. Nor does the general resemblance end here; the very details are the same, and the section of the base referred to by Professor Willis is identical with the bases employed at Sens Cathedral. Take now the design of any other cathedral of the same date, either Noyon or Bourges, and observe how totally unlike are the proportions and arrangements. Although each example shows great artistic power, this composition is so distinct that the hand of a different artist is immediately observable, but looking at the two buildings referred to, viz., Sens and Canterbury Cathedral, if historical records were wholly wanting, we might without hesitation declare that the two buildings were designed by the same architect owing to the mannerism so remarkably evident in both structures. I do not use this term in depreciation of such undoubtedly beautiful architecture, but simply as proving how difficult it is for any man to divest himself of certain trammels whereby he involuntary repeats himself.

In the lecture read by Mr. Scott before this Institute, entitled "Gleanings from Westminster Abbey," he remarks upon the essentially French character in the details of Canterbury choir as distinguished from the vernacular architecture of the thirteenth century. This again may be cited as a proof of William of Sens continental manner.

It may here be remarked that it was not improbable some English architects who had opportunities of travelling abroad, and there seen buildings erected in France and Germany upon plans and principles then unknown to them, may have adopted their novel arrangements. In this manner Mr. Scott accounts for the peculiar design of the chevet forming the east end of St. Peter's Church, Westminster. He says, "There can be little doubt that King Henry III, during his sojourn in France, became enamoured of this arrangement, which in its perfected form he may have seen in course of being carried out at Amiens, Beauvais, Rheims, and elsewhere. It would naturally strike him as being well suited to the reconstruction of the eastern portion of a church already possessing an apse with a continuous aisle. Judging from internal evidence, which is all we have to go upon till the public documents and the archives of the abbey are more thoroughly searched, I should imagine that an English architect or master of the works was commissioned to visit the great cathedrals then in progress of erection in France, with a view of making his design or the general idea suggested by them. Would that, like his contemporary Vilars de Honecort, he had bequeathed to us his sketch book."

The general resemblance here referred to does not amount to any proof of identity between the building and its architect, such as I have sought to prove in the earlier churches I have mentioned, but it is a most interesting fact, as stated by Mr. Scott, that Westminster Abbey is the only introduction into England of the perfect French arrangement of chapels at the eastern extremity of the church, as a chevet, a combination of design beautiful beyond comparison; indeed, the square termini of our cathedrals are

not worthy to be considered, or in any degree equivalent to the charm of those groups of radiating chapels at Amiens, Beauvais, Le Mans, Cologne, Prague, and elsewhere, and it seems rather remarkable that when other buildings were really copied almost literally by their architects and transplanted into England, so beautiful an arrangement as the chevet, of which Westminster Abbey affords a noble example, should not have taken root in this island.

In the minute particulars arising out of the comparison of the east end of Westminster with the contemporaneous churches of France, Mr. Scott mentions remarkable points of difference and an absence of any such marks as might be sufficient to refer this masterpiece of design and construction to any known architect, neither could he detect a French character in the details, although the composition is so essentially and singularly foreign. In this respect Westminster Abbey stands almost alone. It is indeed a building of marvellous beauty internally; its lofty arcade, richly diapered sprandils, deeply moulded triforium, with its double order of traceried arches surmounted by lofty clerestory windows, form a composition hardly to be surpassed. Nor is there any cathedral bearing close resemblance to it. Yet strange to say, the nave of this building has been often compared with the nave of Rheims Cathedral, to which it bears very little similarity, Westminster being infinitely superior, excepting always the west front of Rheims, which is a composition of matchless beauty and a perfect marvel of sculpture. The only reason one can assign for its being put in comparison with Rheims is, that like Westminster it has been the church generally chosen for coronations.

Professor Willis adduces other remarkable repetitions of Ernulf's work at Canterbury and Rochester, both in the walls, arcades, and singular diapering. And in William of Sens' work, the base mouldings of the columns employed by him at Sens cathedral and Canterbury are identical; we might even assert that the masons used the same face mouldings.

Take again another example between the work of Bishop Leffrid II., who is known to have completed the cathedral of Chichester in 1199, where the round and square abaci occur in juxtaposition, and the details of the conventual church of Boxgrove, close by Watlington. Nobody examining the details of these buildings can doubt that they were the work of the same hand: the practised eye at once detects the characteristic marks; and, although the archives of the conventual church afford no information concerning the builder, we can unhesitatingly affirm that Bishop Leffrid must have been engaged both on the capitular and conventual edifices. Mr. Petit, in his paper upon Boxgrove church, read before the meeting of the Archæological Institute in 1859, bears testimony to the same effect. He says:—"I think any antiquary would be disposed to assign this church to the first quarter of the thirteenth century; and a comparison of it with the presbytery of Chichester, of which the date is accurately ascertained, would confirm him in the suggestion. For the pew arches, with their circumscribing arch, and the clerestory of Boxgrove, are so like the triforium and clerestory in the cathedral, that one might imagine them to be designed by the same person; at all events, copied within a short time; and there is a great similarity also in the mouldings."

Another illustration of this kind is afforded by an examination of the architecture of the beautiful church of St. Cross, near Winchester. The hospital was founded in 1136, by Henry de Blois, Bishop of Winchester, to whom also is attributed the design of the abbey church of Romsey. Like that church, it seems to have been built from one uniform plan; but, being erected during a transitional period, exhibits all the variety of detail incidental to the architectural movements then in progress. An examination of the east end of the choir of St. Cross shows in many parts such a striking resemblance to portions of Romsey, that we have here unmistakable proofs of the same hand; not only are the details almost fac-similes, but a singularity of composition pervades both buildings in the greater decoration of the north sides of each building. At Romsey, the arcade which adorns the clerestory on

the north side is altogether wanting towards the south; and at St. Cross, the windows which on the south side are quite plain both in the aisle and clerestory, are on the north side richly ornamented. Whatever may be the reason for this singularity of design the coincidence is noteworthy. There is another large and interesting church in the diocese of Winchester, less known than Romsey, St. Cross, Christchurch, but possessing much architectural beauty. I refer to the Church of All Saints, at Crondall, near Farnham. When called upon some years since to report upon the condition of the chancel of this church, I was much struck with the resemblance of many of its details to those of St. Cross. I could even trace the same face-moulds in the abaci and aisle mouldings. Upon investigating the history of the building, I learned that the church was founded by the same Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester—the munificent founder of St. Cross and builder of Farnham Castle; and hence was at once explained that identity of character which had arrested my notice without any previous knowledge of authorship.

In the preceding remarks upon the buildings of St. Etienne, at Caen, and the Norman structure of Canterbury cathedral, Flambard's Christchurch, and Durham, Sens cathedral, and Canterbury cathedral choir, the marks of resemblance have been confined to parts of each building only, and some of the details; but it is believed that if the proportions of each structure were compared, a rule of composition would be deducible, peculiar to the designer of each building. Professor Willis has, indeed, noticed this in commenting upon Lanfranc's work at Canterbury; but descending two centuries later, we come to the grand buildings erected by William of Wykeham. The works of this great architect are well worthy the attentive study of every true lover of ancient art. His fame and works are too well known to need any lengthened account here, and it would be beside my object to enter upon such task; but his buildings afford another illustration of my theory. Those present who are acquainted with the details of his architecture at Winchester Cathedral, and the Colleges of Winchester and New College, Oxford, cannot fail to discover the unerring marks of this great master in these buildings. Remarkable as are the proportions and details of his superstructures, there is yet a charm in the proportions of his buildings which has been justly attributed to some rules in the distribution of the parts of his plans, which are identical in his Chapels at Winchester and Oxford, and not discoverable in the other collegiate chapels. In a most interesting and learned paper upon the works of William of Wykeham, read by our late respected President, Professor Cockerell, before the members of the Archæological Institute, at their Winchester meeting, under the presidency of the Marquis of Northampton, in 1845, the Professor dwells much upon various ichnographic geometrical proportions which governed the plans of many structures; and, in reference to Wykeham's buildings, he proves most satisfactorily that the pleasure which is derived from the contemplation of the chapels at New College and Winchester is entirely due to harmony of proportion reduced to a geometrical scale; and by comparing these chapels with others at Oxford, the contrast is at once observable. Here, again, we have unquestionable marks establishing the individuality of the architect, though rather in the matter of general composition than details. By instituting a parallel between the known works of eminent mediæval architects, there can be little doubt that rules of proportion would be eliminated. The investigation of this subject, however, would require much care; hasty conclusions must not be drawn; the mere circumstance that one or two mouldings agree in their proportions does not establish a general rule. The use of identical details and separate features of design may afford strong presumptive evidence of authorities, and be convincing; but the mere general similarity of proportion is not so sure a test for discovering the name of the builder as the first mentioned peculiarity. Many able men have laboured hard to prove and establish a system or theory upon which they believe all ecclesiastical buildings to have been designed. Amongst the most recent is Professor Henzleman. The wonderful industry

which this gentleman shewed in collecting examples, and entering into the most minute calculations, almost exceeds belief. This subject, as some of my audience will recollect, was brought under the notice of the Institute by Professor Henzleman, in December, 1852; and so much importance was attached to his assertions, that a committee was appointed by the council to confer with the author, and investigate the whole subject. This interesting task was delegated to the late Sir Charles Barry, Mr. Scott, and myself. We had several meetings with Mr. Henzleman, and heard attentively all he advanced in support of his theory, but his conclusions were not such as to produce conviction. He appeared to have constructed numerous scales, and, by applying one or other of them to a building, showed that certain parts of the structure consisted either in plan or elevation of some fractional part of the scale. It would be difficult to meet with any building, either ancient or modern, which would not be conformable to this mode of mensuration. It establishes no principle whatever, and determines nothing.

Now, in the cases which I have hitherto mentioned the resemblances are not confined to small portions of each building, but extend to the general plan and design of the structure. Let me now, however, allude to the leading feature in an abbey church, which is so marvellously like the tower of another cathedral church that though in other respects the design bears no similarity, it is scarcely possible to doubt but that the same builder must have been concerned in both structures. It may be that the architect, satisfied and pleased with his erection in the south-west of England, was content to repeat his work in a midland county. I refer to what remains of the once magnificent Abbey Church of Pershore, near Worcester. Probably those who merely know the building by its general outline and character will be surprised to hear that the tower (or rather the two stages of it) which remain above the roof, are so like the two corresponding stages of the base of Salisbury Cathedral spire as to be almost identical in design. The composition may be thus described:—The first story rising out of the junction of the nave, transepts and choir, has double couplet windows set upon the acutely pointed weather mouldings of the roofs, the heads of these windows only are pierced, each angle of the tower has bold but peculiar turrets, and this peculiarity exists also at Salisbury; the north-east turret containing the stairs, being larger than the other three, and perforated with numerous slit lights. This stage terminates with a bold projecting stringcourse and ornamentally embattled parapet, the stringcourse profusely ornamented with the ball flowers. Above this rises the second or belfry stage, upon a set off all round. This stage is highly ornamented on each side, and may be represented as consisting of four richly carved compartments with traceried and gabled canopies, each separated by small buttresses and pinnacles. The two centre compartments form window openings, the others are blank, but have mullions and tracery heads like the rest. This stage has also a stringcourse with ball flowers; at present the tower terminates here abruptly with a parapet. There can be no doubt that it was intended to be loftier, though from some unforeseen cause it ends in its present truncated shape. Now, according to the rules of probability we should have looked for the characteristic resemblance of this tower with that of the cathedral church of Worcester, but it is utterly unlike. There is, however, in the style and architectural features of the choir, ladye chapel and small transepts of Worcester Cathedral a close correspondence with the like portions of Salisbury Cathedral, and it is very singular that the tower of Pershore should be so uncommonly like the lower part of the central tower of Salisbury Cathedral also. Upon examining the accounts which are handed down to us relating to Pershore, there is a list of the abbots who presided over the abbey from the Conquest to the period of the dissolution of the establishment at the Reformation, and some incidental notices are given of the building of the Abbey Church. No mention is made respecting the erection of the beautiful choir, central tower and ladye chapel, but reference is made to the devastation which the building suffered by fire at different times. In Nash's "History of Worcester," and in the valuable collection of the

Pratlington Manuscripts in the Library of the Society of Antiquaries, which I have carefully searched, I can discover no clue to the architect of the remains of this beautiful structure. Remembering, however, the proximity of Pershore to the famous Abbey of Evesham, and the fact that more than one of the monks of the former was Abbot of Evesham, I sought for the list of the abbots of this once stately monastery, and found a goodly description of them in Nash's "History of Evesham," and curiously enough discovered the following entry:—"William de Wytechurch or Marlborough, Monk of Pershore, and afterwards Abbot of Evesham, 1282," and it is added that in his time and that of his successor extensive progress was made in the building of the Abbey Church, &c. Now this William de Wytechurch, in Wiltshire, if not connected with the church at Sarum, must have been familiar with the architectural works then being carried forward within twenty miles of his birth-place, the fame of which was famous throughout England. It is known that the cathedral at New Sarum was begun in the middle of the thirteenth century, and took more than forty years in building. Now nothing can be more probable than that William de Wytechurch, struck with the beauty of the works at the cathedral church of Sarum, either brought with him from Wiltshire the master mason or became himself the architect of the tower of Pershore, adopting the design of the tower of Salisbury. Whether the tower and spire at Pershore were ever completed there is no evidence to show, and though it is recorded that the former tower built in the Norman style fell, there is no tradition of a similar disaster happening to the building of the thirteenth century. I however strongly incline to the belief that the tower and spire were finished, and that some calamity afterwards happened, leaving the lower part in its present unfinished condition. We can judge how imperfect must have been the construction, which imposed the necessity of building the huge raking buttress at the north-east angle, which, though boldly designed, greatly injures the external effect of the church. Any one comparing the towers of Worcester Cathedral and Pershore must at once see how much more masterly are the details of the latter, and it is further no rash supposition to infer that the architect of Pershore may have had some connection with those other portions of the Church of Worcester, which also bear so much similarity to Salisbury.

Applying the test which has been dwelt upon in the preceding remarks to one of the most beautiful towers in Somerset (I mean St. Mary's tower, Taunton), a popular notion respecting that structure will be refuted; or rather I should say the former structure, though I must here state that the new tower, built under the superintendence of Mr. Scott and myself, is a careful facsimile in every respect of the ancient design. This tower was said by many to have been designed by Sir Reginald Bray, whose undoubted works at St. George's Chapel, Windsor, and Great Malvern, are well known. This conclusion rests only for its foundation upon the circumstance that the initials R. B. were carved upon some shields ornamenting the transoms of the belfry windows, and which letters have been claimed as the initials of the great architect. Now Sir Reginald succeeded Bishop Beauchamp as surveyor of the works at St. George's Chapel; and it will be observed how profusely his arms and devices are scattered over the nave and transepts of that chapel; whereas, the letters R. B. are the only marks sculptured upon the shields on the tower, forming too slender grounds for identifying the building with Sir Reginald Bray; and I am satisfied that no intelligent antiquary or architect on comparing St. George's Chapel and Bray's other works with the tower of St. Mary's, would believe that the latter could have been designed by him (although built probably about the same time). There is no similarity either in composition or detail, or a single point of coincidence between the buildings. St. George's Chapel has its arcades, stone vaulting, and windows constructed throughout with depressed four-centred arches. The greater part also of Malvern Abbey Church is constructed in a similar manner; and the details have not the spirit which was so beautifully carried out at St. Mary's, Taunton, where all the fenestral features and panelling were elegantly designed, with arches of two centres only; neither do

the sunk mouldings of the window jambs show any such resemblance in section as we might expect to find in works of the same artist; it is also most unlikely that so distinguished a man as Bray would have omitted to place either his arms or devices in some prominent position, whilst we see that elsewhere he used them so freely as ornaments to his buildings. I think, therefore, this tower may with much more truth be assigned to Richard Beare, an abbot of the great Abbey of Glastonbury in the same diocese. The same letters R. B., accompanied with the mitre (he being a mitred Abbot), are to be found on St. Benedict's Church, Glastonbury, and also on some Alms-houses situated in the outskirts of the town of Taunton. I am far from supposing that any great architect would tamely repeat the identical mouldings generally; yet there can be no doubt that some men have preference for peculiar forms, proportions, and details, which are therefore always observable in their works, and often form criteria by which, in the absence of other proofs, their buildings may be recognized. Everybody knows that in the sister art of Painting, the works of distinguished painters are clearly discovered by the peculiarities of colour, style, and treatment; and a connoisseur will tell you with certainty the name of the artist whose works are placed before him without the aid of initials or autograph. So also in sculpture, though perhaps with somewhat less certainty; yet there are marks by which the sculptor's work may be identified, notwithstanding the want of historical evidence. It would, I think, be very interesting to institute a careful comparison between the magnificent monumental remains throughout the cathedrals and churches of this country. The name of the artist who designed the splendid canopied tombs of Crouchback and Aymer de Valence is unknown; but in all probability it was the same artist who designed the monuments of Gervase Alard, Admiral of the Cinque Ports, erected in Winchelsea church. The composition and details are so like in style as to justify this belief. There are other monuments, such as Archbishop Peckham, in Canterbury cathedral, of a less ambitious character, which would seem to proceed from the same hand. Coming to a later period, I may cite the well known monuments also of the Cobham family, in Lingfield church. When examining these tombs with the members of the Surrey Archæological Institute, last August, I was much struck with the remarkable resemblance in the ornamental details of the armour of the knight, and the vestments of his lady, with the habiliments of the effigies of Sir John and Lady Chideock, in the priory church of Christchurch, Hants. Upon referring to an historical account of the Lords of Stourborough Castle, in the last volume of the Surrey Archæological Society, I there learnt that the beautiful tomb with the recumbent figures referred to, represented the second Sir Reginald Cobham and his wife, founders of Lingfield College. This Sir Reginald Cobham and Sir John Chideock, of Chideock, in Dorsetshire, his wife's brother, were knighted by Henry VI., in the fourth year of his reign. What is more probable, therefore, than that the same sculptor should be employed by the descendants of these related persons in the design and erection of their joint family tombs? It is only to be regretted that the name of the sculptor who could produce such beautiful figures is unknown. There are, again, numerous magnificent chantries and tombs in our cathedral and abbey churches, erected about the time of Henry VIII., when the admixture of classical details with Mediæval forms produced the Renaissance style, which may be attributed to the workmanship of one man.

It is well known that at this period eminent Italian artists were brought into England at the instance of Henry VII. and his distinguished nobles. A few years since, interesting documents were found recording minutely the contracts entered into with Pietro Torrigiano, the painter and sculptor of Florence (who came over in 1512), for the erection of the tomb to Henry VII., and also for a contemplated tomb for Henry VIII. and Queen Katharine. The identical arabesque ornamentation of the friezes and pilasters of Henry VII.'s tomb are repeated upon parts of the beautiful chantry chapel of Margaret, Countess of Salisbury, in Christchurch Priory Church; and his work, I think, can

be traced in many other monumental shrines of distinguished personages in our cathedrals and large churches. Sufficient has been advanced to show what an interesting field of research in the direction I have indicated lays open to those whose professional tours in the country give them the opportunities of comparing buildings and monuments with each other, and I think it is peculiarly the province of the professional architect to pursue this course. No opinion of the mere antiquarian, if unaccompanied by some knowledge of construction, can be conclusive.

The PRESIDENT, PROFESSOR DONALDSON, having invited some observations on the paper—

Mr. BERESFORD-HOPE, Hon. Fellow, said although he had not made a minute study of the buildings of the class on which Mr. Ferrey had discoursed, which as an amateur he delighted to do, he could testify to the pleasure they must all feel at the collection of examples which that gentleman had brought before them to illustrate the gradual working out of those difficulties, which with increasing knowledge they must more and more recognize as existing in the history of Mediæval architecture. In those ages there was neither the rapid transmission of ideas nor of materials which existed in the present day. The history of the professional education of the men who practised, the way in which working drawings seemed to have passed from hand to hand as a kind of cherished property, were among the incidents of architectural progress which he feared they would never be able to fathom.

Mr. WYATT PAPWORTH, Fellow, said it perhaps would be remembered he had submitted two papers to the Institute of a similar character to that they had just heard; and being greatly interested in the subject, he rose with great pleasure to move that the best thanks of the meeting be given to Mr. Ferrey for his valuable paper; he would append to that motion—that he be requested to add to the title, after “Mediæval architects,” the words “and builders.” He proposed this for the reason that he entirely disagreed with the idea that the persons mentioned could be considered as *architects*; having given some study to the question, from the information he had obtained he could not do otherwise than doubt whether such personages possessed any *architectural* knowledge. With respect to the first mentioned—Gundulf—of whose life such elaborate details had just been given, his friend Mr. Ashpitel and himself had gone carefully through all the documentary evidence on the subject, and both were of opinion that he was no *architect*, as the word was now understood. Mr. Papworth considered that all these archbishops and bishops had master masons, to whom he firmly believed the whole credit of the design and erection of the buildings was due. He thought that when the clergy in early times were promoted from priory to abbey, from abbey to cathedral, and from see to see, that they often took their master mason with them, which would account for the copyism, or at least the great similarity found in certain buildings described by Mr. Ferrey. He had obtained during the last eight or ten years a large mass of materials of a similar nature to that with which the meeting had been favored. The strongest evidences existed that many parts of buildings had been copied one from another; and in his own collection were notices that parts of one structure were proposed to be copied from another. The type exhibited at the mother church was to be seen in the various churches built in the same era around it. Near Ely there are some churches which are acknowledged as having been built by masons employed at the monastic establishment. He believed that in early times the best artificers were principally to be found at the monastic establishments; afterwards they set up for themselves as masons, builders, and so on, in the larger towns. Of all the persons mentioned the only one to whom he could apply the term *architect* was William of Sens. Mr. Ferrey had not given any outline of his life, but documentary evidence existed to show that he was a working mason; and in the well known competition of artificers for carrying out the great work at Canterbury, William of Sens was the one selected as the best master mason: and had not Gervase's account come down to us, the rebuilding

would always have been known as the work of "Archbishop Richard, *the architect*." Mr. Ferrey considered that the clergy living in monasteries had "undisturbed lives," and were therefore able to give that attention to the study of architecture, for which the laity had neither the time, nor the means, nor the education. He himself thought it could hardly be possible to find a more busy man than Gundulf, excepting perhaps Flambard, and the words quoted could hardly apply to them. The former was always most actively engaged, as appeared from the historical records that had been handed down to us by a monk who lived a few years after his death; it was hardly to be supposed, therefore, that Gundulf had given personal supervision to the numerous works to which his name was associated; that he was a great *builder* no one could doubt, and the same might very properly be said of Flambard, of William of Wykeham, and of others. They each appeared to have abundant means at command, and they spent them in erecting the fine buildings of which we were so proud, and to which their names had been applied. He thought he had proved that William of Wykeham had his master mason, and it was known that William de Wynford in his early days was the king's mason, and possibly worked for that bishop at Windsor; it was well known that he was employed by him at his college at Winchester, as Wynford's portrait existed there; and also on the works at the cathedral of the same city: he might also have been so at Wykeham's structure of New College, Oxford. Mr. Ferrey had mentioned the cloisters at Norwich Cathedral as having been a long time in hand, yet carried out according to one design; the name of the master mason who commenced that structure was known, and his design was continued through a period of nearly three centuries. In conclusion he (Mr. Papworth) desired to express the great pleasure with which he had listened to the paper, and to bear his testimony to the great accuracy of the descriptions given of those buildings with which he was acquainted. He would only add, that unless the knowledge of architecture and building possessed by the bishops and ecclesiastics of olden times had been greater than it was at the present day, it certainly would not have attained to any very great eminence.

Mr. MORRIS, Associate, remarked with regard to the circular building pointed out by Mr. Ferrey as charged externally with net-work, shells, and twisted ornaments that had probably some symbolical signification, it seemed to him (Mr. Morris) that they bore what might be termed an aquatic character. This might, he thought, have some relation to the metaphor used by our Saviour in his summons to Peter and Andrew, who from mere catchers of fish were promoted to be apostles and "fishers of men." (Matthew, c. iv, v. 19.) It was also to be recollected that in early Christian ages, previous to the introduction of fonts into churches and the celebration of baptism by priests, that that rite had been exclusively performed by the bishops. There was at Ripon Cathedral a building, older perhaps than the main fabric, and reputed to have been a baptistery; such buildings were generally circular. Upon the support such an impression seemed to derive from these particulars he desired to ask Mr. Ferrey whether the building at Christchurch, to which he had drawn attention, was built for a similar purpose.

Mr. FERREY said that this circular building stood at the north-east corner of the transept, over the crypt. It was therefore not easy to imagine that it could have been designated as a baptistery in any sense. The date of it was known; it would be the latter end of the eleventh century.

Mr. BERESFORD-HOPE, having seconded the vote of thanks to Mr. Ferrey.

THE PRESIDENT said it had been remarked by that gentleman how interesting it was to seek out and ascertain the names of the architects of our cathedral churches. He felt how true was that observation, because it opened up other sources of enquiry of the highest interest, such as the *schools* from which were derived all the variety of sentiments and feelings which prevailed in the Mediaeval monuments of this country. On going into our cathedrals it was evident that different types and



characters and thought were prevalent in those edifices, distinguishing the one from the other. Similar types were found to prevail throughout the European continent. In Germany and France was discoverable the repetition of the same sentiments as in our own cathedrals. It would appear that Durham and Christchurch had been designed by the same architect; and there was to be traced in examples abroad two distinct developments of the Byzantine; for there were the German Byzantine, the French Byzantine, the Lombard Byzantine, as well as the English Byzantine. Durham reflected the Lombard Byzantine more than any other; as, for instance, in the square piers with the vaulting shafts, which formed the great divisions of the nave, and the heavy columns between those piers dividing the bay into two openings. They found the same style prevalent in the Church of St. Peter, at Northampton, with the same piers and vaulting shafts, and the intermediate columns, resembling the Byzantine of the Lombard type which was found in many of the churches of Lombardy, as, for instance, at St. Zeno, Verona. Another type was that of the French Byzantine, as in Caen, where the arches were in a continuous line of the same size. These implied two distinct principles; and Flambard must either have been himself inoculated with the feeling of the Lombard style, or else borrowed it from the architects of such buildings as Durham and Northampton. Then another type is traceable, as at Oxford and Romsey, which Mr. Ferrey believed both to have been designed by the same architect. His (the President's) own opinion was, that there was a connection between the religious establishments in this country and those abroad, so that when a fraternity in England contemplated the erection of some great or novel work, they would apply to their brethren abroad, who sent over an architect capable of doing it; or else, one from England was sent abroad to study the peculiar examples of that country. Referring to the inscription "*fecit*" on some of the works mentioned by Mr. Ferrey, it was noticeable that the classical artists never used the perfect tense, but always the imperfect, *i.e.*, "*faciebat*," as though the work were progressing, and not as completed; this was curious as a literary question. With regard to the late Mr. Cockerell's and Herr Henzleman's theories of the geometric law, which governed the proportions and forms of Mediæval architecture, he felt there must be some such existing; it had eluded their research hitherto; he, however, could not but think, that in building, as in other arts, there were geometrical combinations and proportions which, though undiscovered at present, might have served as a guide to the architects of those buildings. He had great pleasure in putting the resolution of the vote of thanks.

Mr. FERREY said that he hardly felt justified in at once accepting Mr. Papworth's proposition, and that he was not disposed to set aside records and documents which spoke freely and emphatically, merely because his friend thought it more desirable to insert the words "and builders," or "master masons." He saw no reason why the bishops of former days should not have been more gifted in the way of architectural knowledge than their brethren of the present day, and he had no doubt whatever the old bishops were the architects of those works which stand in their names.

The vote of thanks to Mr. Ferrey having been passed unanimously, the meeting adjourned.